UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,736	03/22/2004	Robert Falotico	CRD-5071	9584
27777 PHILIP S. JOH	7590 08/30/201 [.] NSON	EXAMINER		
JOHNSON & J	OHNSON	WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E		
	N & JOHNSON PLAZ VICK, NJ 08933-7003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/30/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jnjuspatent@corus.jnj.com lhowd@its.jnj.com gsanche@its.jnj.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/805,736	FALOTICO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	KEVIN WEDDINGTON	1614				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
• •	VIC SET TO EVRIDE 2 MONTH	I(S) OD THIDTY (20) DAVS				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron te, cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>July</u>	/ 28, 2010.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		, ,				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Offic	e Action of form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 						
application from the International Burea	•	ved in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ved.				
	,					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summar	ry (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail I	Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7-28-2010</u> ; <u>8-4-2010</u> .	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	гасті Арріісацоп				

Claims 1-5 are presented for examination.

Applicants' request for continued examination filed July 28, 2010; information disclosure statements filed July 28, 2010 and August 4, 2010; and the terminal disclaimers filed July 27, 2010 have been received and entered.

Accordingly, the rejections made under obviousness-type double patenting over claims 5-8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,419,678 and provisional obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-6 of copending application no. 11/149,466 as set forth in the previous Office action dated July 22, 2010 at pages 2-5 as applied to claims 1-5 are hereby withdrawn because the applicants submitted two terminal disclaimers.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a written description rejection.

A lack of adequate written description issue arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., Fujikawa v. Wattanasin, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species); In re Ruschig, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967).

An applicant may also show that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.

In particular, the specification as original filed fails to provide sufficient written bases of any of the agents demonstrating wherein possession of use of the broad term: **a biocompatible, implantable structure**. The mere fact that Applicant may have discovered one type of biocompatible, implantable structure is coated with the instant composition is not sufficient to claim the entire genus. The entire genus of biocompatible implantable structures encompasses cervical implants, orthopedic implants, spinal implants, dermal implants and breast implants.

The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. See Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

A "representative number of species" means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus. The disclosure of only one species encompassed within a genus adequately describes a claim directed to that genus only if the disclosure "indicates that the patentee has invented species sufficient to constitute the gen[us]."

Claims 1 and 5 are not allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN WEDDINGTON whose telephone number is (571)272-0587. The examiner can normally be reached on 12:30 pm - 9:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571)272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/805,736 Page 5

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KEVIN WEDDINGTON Primary Examiner Art Unit 1614

/KEVIN WEDDINGTON/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614